

Remarks

The present invention is a method of handling Wireless Session Protocol (WSP) sessions between a wireless communication terminal and a corresponding server, a wireless communication network for handling Wireless Session Protocol (WSP) sessions between a wireless communication terminal and a corresponding server connected via said network, a server unit for use in a wireless communication network for supporting Wireless Session Protocol (WSP) sessions and a wireless communication terminal for use in a wireless communication network for supporting Wireless Session Protocol (WSP) sessions with a server. The present invention provides a savings of session costs by eliminating the need for re-sending user profile information many times. See page 5, lines 8-28, of the Specification.

The Examiner has required new drawings. Submitted herewith are new drawings having legends applied to the blocks of Figs. 1 and 2.

The Examiner's requirement regarding the Abstract being objected to because it includes the Title of the invention is not understood. The Title of the invention is "A Method of and A Method For Handling Wireless Session Protocol (WSP) Sessions". It is believed that this information is not contained in the Abstract. Accordingly, if the Examiner continues with the objection to the Abstract, it is requested that he point out on the record what information he is requiring to be deleted from the Abstract. Additionally, the Specification has been amended to improve its form for re-examination including the removal of embedded hyperlinks.

Claims 1, 7 and 11 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by USP 5,732,214 (Subrahmanyam). These grounds of rejection are traversed with respect to newly submitted claims 17, 25 and 29 which correspond to claims 1, 7 and 11. These grounds of rejection are traversed for the following reasons.

Each of independent claims 17, 25 and 29 substantively recites a session involving a request for earlier requested data which has no counterpart in Subrahmanyam. Subrahmanyam discloses a system for universal archival service. The Examiner has relied upon the embodiment therein shown in Fig. 7. However, it is submitted that the embodiment shown in Fig. 7 and further the disclosure of Subrahmanyam does not disclose the aforementioned subject matter involving a request for earlier requested data.

What is described in Subrahmanyam is a system for archiving data but the architecture of that system is not described as having a functionality regarding the claimed request for earlier requested data. In this context, claim 17 recites, *inter alia*, "forwarding a request for earlier requested data to the server comprising an identification of the earlier requested data and a communication terminal identification number provided by the server; the server, when receiving a request containing the earlier requested data and the communication terminal identification number recalls user profile information from an associated data base memory corresponding to said communication terminal identification number and said user profile information indicates a data format which will be handled by the communication terminal for the earlier requested data; and the server replies to the request for earlier requested data by forwarding the earlier requested data in the format defined by the user profile"; claim 7 recites, *inter alia*, "means in the communication terminal for initiating a session by forwarding a request for earlier requested data to the server, said request for earlier requested data comprises an identification of the earlier requested data and a communication terminal identification number provided by the server"; a data memory connected to the server in order to store user profile information based on the communication terminal identification received in the request for earlier requested data, said user

profile information indicates the data format which may be handled by the communication terminal; processing means in order to recall the stored user profile information corresponding to the communication terminal identification number and for replying to the request for earlier requested data by forwarding the earlier requested data in the format defined by the user profile via transmission means to the communication terminal"; and claim 29 recites *inter alia* "said database contains user profile information for a plurality of communication terminals, said user profile information indicates the date of format which may be handled by the communication terminal; said input means are adapted to receive a request for earlier requested data from the communication terminal; said request initiates a session and comprises an identification of the earlier requested data and a communication terminal identification number; said processing means recalls the stored user profile information by means of the communication terminal identification number received in the request for the earlier requested data; and said processing means replies to the request for earlier requested data by forwarding the earlier requested data in the format defined by the user profile via said input means.

Subrahmanyam does not disclose any of aforementioned subject matter since Subrahmanyam's processing is disclosed in the context of an architecture in which only initial requests for data from a terminal to the archival system are processed.

Moreover, the Examiner has misconstrued the meaning of a communication terminal identification number. The Examiner states that a communication terminal identification number is interpreted by the Examiner to mean a user-specific personal identification number (PIN). It is well known in the art that a PIN is an identification of a user of accounts and cards such as credit or debit cards. Moreover, Subrahmanyam clearly defines a PIN, contrary to the Examiner's definition, in column 4, lines 28-57 wherein a PIN is described as a user specific use

for billing purposes. Accordingly, Subrahmanyam neither anticipates nor render obvious the subject matter of newly submitted independent claims 17, 25 and 29. Moreover, newly submitted claims 23 and 35 are patentable for the same reasons set forth above.

Claims 2, 5, 6, 8 and 12 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Subrahmanyam. These claims are patentable for the reasons set forth above regarding the deficiencies of Subrahmanyam pertaining to the newly submitted independent claims.

Claims 3-4, 9-10 and 13-16 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Subrahmanyam in view of USP 5,958,006 (Eggleston et al). These grounds of rejection are traversed for the following reasons.

Eggleston et al has been cited for teaching a server which deletes user profile information from a data base memory upon expiration of a period of time. However, the subject matter of Eggleston et al does not cure the deficiencies noted above with regard to Subrahmanyam.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that each of the claims in the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that there are any other points which may be clarified or otherwise disposed of, either by telephone discussion or by a personal interview, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative at the number indicated below.

To the extent necessary, applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR §1.136. Please charge any shortage in the fees due in connection with the

filing of this paper, to the Deposit Account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP,
Dep. Acct. No. 01-2135 (1030.39226X00), and please credit any excess fees to
such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



Donald E. Stout
Reg. No. 26,422

DES/dks
703-312-6600
N:\1030\39226X00\AMD\BB3332.DOC